

A *Printed. 11.*
VINDICATION
OF THE
Bishop of Salisbury
AND
PASSIVE OBEDIENCE,
WITH SOME
REMARKS
UPON A
SPEECH

Which goes under his Lordship's Name.

AND A
POSTSCRIPT,

In Answer to a BOOK, just Publish'd, Entitul'd,
*Some Considerations humbly offer'd to the Right
Reverend the Lord Bishop of Salisbury, &c.*

Printed in the Year M.DCC.X.

A
VINDICATION
OF THE

Bishop of *Salisbury*

AND

PASSIVE OBEDIENCE,

WITH

Some Remarks upon a Speech,
which goes under his Lordship's
Name.

AS many a good Cause has been betray'd by false Friends, so many a bad one has miscarried in the Hands of ill Managers. An *Achitophel's* Counsel, tho' never so deeply laid, has often (even without an *Hushai's* countermining) defeated, and may still defeat itself. Weak and ill grounded Premisses can bring forth no other but a void and null Conclusion. Thence it is, that nothing of late has confirmed me more in believing, that Passive-Obedience and Non-Resistance have been the Doctrines of the Church of *England*, than what has been alledged to disprove them by its mercenary, malicious and impotent Foes; more particularly in a Pamphlet strutting about under the mighty Name of the Bishop of *Salisbury's* Speech, for I have reasons to doubt whether his Lordship ever made or spoke it.

The Bulk of the Discourse, exceeds the ordinary Size of most Speeches; and tho' it has not much of the Bible and Divinity in it, yet with a Regard to 16. Pages and the chief Contents of them, might perhaps

perhaps for want of a better, serve * *tanquam* a Sermon on the Revolution, whenever a Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving shall be appointed to be used upon the Anniversary Day of King William's Accession to the Crown: I say still, instead of a better; for the whole is but a Rope of Sand, the Method of it confused, the Connexions incoherent, the Sense (if any) forced, the Expressions in many Places dark. And who will believe, that such a crude and undigested Mass of Stuff can come from so learned a Pen, from the great Author of the History of the Reformation of our Church? Certainly the Owner of this Pamphlet appears to be very ill qualified to write any History unless of Rebellion.

Besides, the Character of that famous and eminent Prelate is drawn in it monster-like and with a double Face.

On the one side, he is represented as one, who [pag. 2.] tho' he served as a Chaplain to the late † King, yet abhorred Rebellion, and therefore had no Command, and carried no Arms: So tender, that tho' he was so far engaged in the Revolution, yet, if he could see he had gone out of the way in that, he should hold himself unworthy to appear longer, either in the Habit of a Bishop, or in the great Assembly

of Peers; So religious, that he thinks nothing to be more certain, than that we ought to repent of every Sin we have committed, and that there is no true Repentance without Restoration, as far as it is in our Power: So conscientiously scrupulous, that [pag. 13.] tho' the Parliament studied to secure the Government by an Association and an Abjuration, yet he being always against every thing that might break in upon Conscience, was for making these only voluntary, but (in spite of his Teeth) they were enacted, and generally taken; a Distinction (ever a true Friend to a weak Conscience at a dead lift) being found, that the abjuring any Right whatsoever that the Pretender might claim, was

only meant of a || Legal Right, and that it had no Relation to || Birth-Right, or to || Divine-Right. So nice a Casuist, that [pag. 12.] tho' receiv'd by the Prince of Orange into his Service with a particular Confidence, yet he, being a Man of Moderation, was not such an High-Flier, as

some of his Country-Men, who soon after the Ecclesiastical Commission was set up, desired the Prince to break with King James upon that Head; he opposed this, tho' he was convinced that Commission was against Law, and would have ill Effects. He with an unparallel'd Christian Patience waited God's time. Again when, upon the Proceedings against Magdalen Colledge, a Breach was more warmly pressed by those unreasonable High-Fliers, He still stood to his Ground of Non-Resistance, like an undaunted Champion of unshaken Loyalty, and resolutely told both Prince and Princess, that he could not serve God's time was not come yet. He ne'er flinched from his Allegiance, till the second publishing of the Declaration, the Arbitrary Dispensation of

* An emphatical Word used by the Author of the Speech to explain our English Particle *as*. pag. 8. lin. 13.

† Quære, whether that Prince before the Revolution was a Calvinist, or of the Church of England.

|| I thought that by the Settlement the Pretender was excluded from all Right, whether Legal, Birth, or Divine.

many Laws, and the making Persons under Legal Disabilities Judges, Sheriffs, and Magistrates, came thick and threefold upon him, beat him off from his ground; in short, till a total Subversion of our Constitution gave him a Dispensation to resist, and forced him (whether he would or no) to be ready to serve in the Revolution. Then, and not till then, God's time was come; To every thing (saith Solomon) there is a Season, and a time to every Purpose under the Sun. I oft wonder'd not to find among the several Things and Purposes mentioned in that Chapter (*Eccles. iii.*) a time to obey and a time to resist; but I remember'd the Author of that Book was not only a Preacher but a King, whose Heart (*1 Kings xi. 4.*) was not perfect with the Lord his God; and therefore he among his other Failings might fancy himself to be King *Jure Divino*, and consequently appointed no Time or Season to Resistance. Trajan and King James the I. understood whose Ministers they were, by using this Expression and Motto [*Pag. 3.*] *Pro me, si merear, in me*; But Henry the VIII. flushed with his Triumph over the Pope (for want of a Remembrancer from the Pulpit) forgot his Commission, and in a certain Letter to his States, has these Words—*Potestatem tam Ecclesiastica quam mundana politia mihi majoribusque meis, ipso Divino jure, concessam ad me & successores meos pertinere unâ voce uno omnium consensu agnoscitis*: and a little after that, quotes the vith of *Wisdom*, *audite Reges & intelligite, quoniam data est à Domino potestas vobis, &c.* Here the King's Memory slept again, and he should have been put in mind, that the Quotation was Apocryphal. Yet upon second Thoughts, why mayn't *Wisdom* be as good an Authority as the *Maccabees*, especially since our Church orders every Word of *Wisdom* and not one of the *Maccabees* to be read for first Lessons? Indeed in some of our Bibles that place of *Wisdom* has a marginal Reference to *Rom. xiii. 1, 2.* and King Henry could have quoted *St. Paul*, who would have been better Authority than *Wisdom*; but again upon consulting a Bible in that King's Reign, I find not that marginal Reference; and who knows (with humble Submission of my poor Conjecture to better Judges) but that some *Jure-Divino-Man*, out of a mistaken zeal for the Sovereignty of Kings and a spight to the Rights of the People, the original Spring of Regal Power, first thrust that unlucky Reference into the Margin? But to be short and say something in behalf of this Letter of Henry the VIIIth, whatever Right or Power he might think he derived from God, he never had that of Prophecy, without which he could never foresee, that a blessed time would come, when Subjects would be taught, that Kings hold their Crown not by the Right of Succession or Inheritance, but by the People.

But to return to the Bishop: Let us see, on the other side, how he is represented in that pretended Speech, under a Character much unbecoming the Worth and Dignity of his Person. *Pag. 15.* Without a just Distance kept between Bishop and Priest, Peer and Commoner; our Prelate and Mr. Hoadley are brought in hand in hand, the first commending and approving the Notions of the last; when I'll make it appear, that the Affection of the one by no means agrees with the Practice of the other. Mr. Hoadley, in his *Measures of Obedience*, sums up his meaning in this Proposition:

“ Suppo-

“ Supposing it true, that Governours act contrary to the end of their
 “ Institution, invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the
 “ ruin of that Society, over which they are placed; it is lawful and
 “ glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick,
 “ and of their Posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such Go-
 “ vernours.

This Trumpeter of Resistance justifies Opposition, whenever a Governour acts contrary to the End of his Institution, &c. Had he been in *Holland* at the same time with his Lordship, he would immediately have listed himself under the Revolution Flag, as soon as the Ecclesiastical Commission (which was against Law, and therefore against the End of Regal Institution, and an Invasion of the Subjects Right) was set up: But even, in this pretended Speech, my Lord's Principles are not represented so deeply ingrained in Rebellion, as to be heated to the pitch of Resistance, by any thing but a total Subversion of the Constitution.

This same Mr. *Hoadley*, to establish his *Measures of Obedience*, purs St. Paul's xiii. Chapter to the *Romans* upon the wrack, to stretch him to his terms; and does wrest (as the *unlearned* and *unstable*, of which St. Peter complains in his 2 *Epist.* iii. 16.) the Words of that great Apostle (which hitherto were used as Arguments against Rebellion) to signify, when Rebellion is lawful. Yet I can't believe, that this single new-fangled Exposition will ever outweigh the Sense of all the learned Expositors, yea even those of *Geneva*, which have writ upon that Passage. Whatever Occasion the Apostles took from the Notion of the Jews about the Text in *Deuteronomy*, c. xvii. v. 15. [*Pag. 3.*] that's but a Guess; and as long as the Apostolical Rule is general, I think it binds Jew and Gentil equally. That the Apostles [*Pag. 3.*] did not meddle to determine where the Authority was lodged, is an unpardonable Mistake; for St. Peter, 1 *Epist.* c. ii. v. 13. bids us pay our Obedience to every Ordinance of Men, whether it be to the King as Supreme, or unto Governours, as unto them, &c. Here indeed the Advocates of the People make a poor sorry shift to criticize upon these Words Ordinance of Men, as if by it was meant an Ordinance established by Men, not for Men: But, as 'tis easy to produce many learned Vouchers for the last, so I challenge the best, or all of them, to bring one in favour of the first Exposition. Besides, I know not by what Propriety of Speech the King can be called *Supreme*, if there be a Superior Ordinance among Men, from which he derives his Power. But the Apostles, plain good Men, were no Politicians; their Master's Kingdom was not of this World; and therefore the Captain of their Salvation, who was made perfect through Sufferings (*Hebr.* c. ii. v. 10. and c. v. v. 8.) taught them only Obedience, which himself had both learned and practiced: As for Rules, when to withdraw that Obedience, neither he nor they left us any. St. Paul bids *Titus* (c. iii. v. 1.) put his Flock in mind to be subject, &c. but never when to cease from being so. St. Peter in his 1. *Epist.* ii. v. 13. after he has deliver'd the Duty of Subjects to the King, and the Governours under him, subjoyns immediately the Duty of Servants to their Masters; and if from the Connexion I should infer that the being subject with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward, may be applied to the Subject's as well as the Servant's

Duty, and that our Saviour's patient Sufferings may be an *Example* and *Pattern* for our Behaviour, under the Oppression of tyrannical Princes, I have a very probable reason for my Inference from the Authority of our Church, which in the Form of Prayer upon the Day of King *Charles* the Martyr, has, ever since the Restoration, without any change in this particular, appointed for the Epistle the *1 Pet. c. ii. v. 13, to v. 23.* which includes the Duty of Subjects to Kings, of Servants to Masters, enforced from the Example of Christ. And I may humbly suppose, that if the Church had not designed a Connexion through all these, and had not thought the Duty of Subjects (which seems to be the proper Doctrine of the Day) concerned in all these Verses, she might as well have ended the Epistle at *v. 17. Honour the King,* as have continued it to *v. 22.* From all this I conclude, that Mr. *Hoadley* was much in the wrong to preach *Measures of Obedience* from the 13th of the *Romans*. I think (with all deference to his profound and unaccountable Judgment) the 40th. Verse of the 107th. *Psalms* had been a much fitter Text, of which Text by and by. *The Primitive Christians* [Pag. 3.] had no Laws in their Favour; and shall we infer from thence, that, if they had had Laws in their Favour, they would have chosen Resistance before Martyrdom? No certainly, *St. Peter's Rule* (*1 Epist. ii. 13.*) is *to submit for the Lord's sake,* and not one Word of the Laws mentioned. And I would gladly be informed, when, after they came to have the Protection of the Laws, they used any Violence, if denied the Benefit of them; and by what Canon and Council such Resistance was approved. Therefore Mr. *Hoadley*, and those of his Stamp, may search long enough in the written Word of God, or into the Ecclesiastical History, for Rules and Examples to direct us, when Subjects may resist. My Lord of *Sarum* knows better things: His great Wisdom, which [Pag. 10.] sees a great way into the Secrets of times, takes Providence for a Rule, and could have foreseen a War, which no body dreamt on, by an unhappy train of Accidents. *Gamaliel* the Jew, tho' never so skill'd in the Points of his Law, could not teach his Disciple Politicks, and the knotty Rules of Obedience and Resistance, with respect to unexpected Revolutions. *Grotius*, in his one Book *De Jure Belli & Pacis*, [Pag. 9.] enumerates more Cases, in which it is lawful to resist, than *Gamaliel* ever knew; and (for ought I know) more than will readily be own'd by a true Son of the Church of *England*, unacquainted with *Dutch* Discipline and Divinity. Besides, my Lord [Pag. 8.] knows the Rules laid down by Dr. *Bedell*, in one of his Books, the best of that time viz. *The Law of Nature, and that of Nations*, both prior (but, by his Lordship's Leave, not superior) to the revealed Law of God. The Primitive Christians (of which a little before) tho' they had no Laws in their Favour, yet might have claim'd the Benefit of these two; but they desired to know nothing but Christ crucified, their only Glory was their Cross. And as for their Skill in the Laws of Nature and Nations, they were not to be compar'd with Dr. *Bedell*, or *Grotius*, much less with my Lord of *Salisbury*.

This shall suffice to shew how his Lordship is disparaged by the Author of this Pamphlet, in pretending that his refined Notions and Mr. *Hoadley's* crude ones are the same. But he does not stop here:

For

For who can bear this great Prelate, and Pillar of our Church, being traduced [Pag. 12.] as one guilty of Collusion and Dissembling, as one of Dr. Falkner's Tribe, who, in preaching the Doctrine of Non-Resistance, had always some Exceptions in their Thoughts, tho' they did not think it necessary to mention them. Is this fair for Ministers of the Gospel, to preach up a Doctrine to the People, and not mention the Exceptions which may be made against it? This makes me tremble with Horror. Again; To tell King James, that unfortunate Prince, it was impossible for him to Reign in quiet in this Nation, being of that Religion; and then, he answering, Does not the Church of England maintain the Doctrine of Non-Resistance and Passive Obedience? to beg of him not to depend on that, for there was a Distinction in that Matter, that would be found out, when Men thought they needed it; what is all this but a vile Equivocation? I believe King James might have enjoyed his Crown to the last, had he been first advised, and then content to keep the Exercise of his Religion private to himself. And on the other side, is this a fair Character of the Professors of our Church to own and maintain Principles, and then distinguish them away at Pleasure. Had not it been more ingenuous to inform that poor deluded Prince, that our Church indeed owned those Principles, but that some did it with, others without a Limitation; that he was in danger from the last; and to acquaint him with those Distinctions and Cases? Far be it, that Church-Loyalty should be like the Staff of a broken Reed (Esaï xxxvi. 6.) whereon if a Prince lean, it will go into his Hand and pierce it. Such Patrons of Occasional Resistance are the fit Patrons of Occasional Conformity; and, as the Scythian Embassadors well observed to Alexander, *Qui non reverentur homines, salunt Deos*, They who can play fast and loose in a Civil Concern, will hardly be true and honest in a Religious one. But my Lord is not for Occasional Resistance, except in the Case of extream Necessity: Then 'tis the Case of the Disciples (John vi. 60.) it is a hard Saying, who can bear it? I'll pass my Word for my Lord (believe me who will) he is a Man of Principles, and tho' (as the best are not free from Slander) he has been aspersed, as having formerly been of a quite contrary Opinion to what he now owns, yet (give his due) he is always the same, only some are too dull, and have not Penetration enough to sound the bottom, and comprehend the unlimited extent of his meaning. Thus for Example, I have known his Lordship vilely reflected on for a Text he chose once on the Day of Humiliation for the [Pag. 11.] barbarous Effusion of the Royal Blood of that blessed King Charles I. The Words were these, taken out of Ps. cvii. 40. *He pours Contempt upon Princes*. I heard the Sermon in Westminster Abby, but (to my great Sorrow) I lost the Notes I took of it; and I can't tell that it was ever printed: If it was not, great pity it is, the World should be bereaved of a piece of so extraordinary Doctrine, and such timely Loyalty; when we see [Pag. 15.] furious Men, Hoadleys, fit themselves with hot Sermons, and spreading their Rights, Priestcraft, &c. far and near, to poison the Nation. But to return to the Bishop's Sermon. To the best of my remembrance, he reconciled the Text to the Day, with a learned Fetch and Dexterity, beyond what a mean vulgar Capacity can reach to; and he then (as always) preached like none but himself.

himself, in a Style, and Strain, not to be imitated. He, above all, preserves a zealous Respect for the Memory of the Holy, and never-to-be-forgotten Martyr; and is persuaded, that notwithstanding [*Pag. 10.*] *the unhappy Misunderstanding between him and the Parliament*, the

* I must humbly beg leave of his Lordship to affirm, that all Human Laws had their first Original from the Laws of God, and that the first Planters of the World, the Patriarchs were instructed by God, how to behave themselves in their Civil, as well as Religious Concerns.

† Quære, Whether they were Principles of Conscience on which the War was founded.

reviving of the condemned Doctrine, about * the Law of Government being from God, Antecedent to all Human Laws, out of which sprung illegal Imprisonments, illegal Monopolies, severe Proceedings in the Star-Chamber; but above all, the Ship-mony; I say, My Lord, is notwithstanding all this persuaded, that [*Pag. 11.*] *the Demand of the Militia was plainly a Rebellion*, but that [*Pag. 10.*] *they are much mistaken, who fancy that the War, at that time, was founded on the † Principles of Self-Defence.*

Hitherto I have given my Reasons, why I believe this Paper not to be the Bishop's genuine Speech: I'm indeed assured, he made a Speech in the House of Lords, on the first Article of Dr. Sacheverel's Impeachment; and it may be likely, that several things here and there inserted in that Paper were spoken, or touched on by him: Yet the main appears as mangled and dis-jointed in it, as Hippolytus's Body was by his wild Horses. I shall go on now to make some Remarks on the Pamphlet, tho' that has partly been, by me, done already in several References to it. The Author's Design (if I mistake him not) is [*Pag. 2.*] *to overthrow this (which he calls Vulgar) Opinion, that by the Doctrine of the Church of England, all Resistance in any Case whatsoever, without Exception, is condemned; and the way by which he engages to do it, is by giving an Account of the Doctrine of our Church in this Particular.* I assert, that he has not overthrown this Opinion, because he has not given an Account of the Doctrine of our Church; which I'll prove as briefly and clearly, as I can.

The Doctrine of the Church of England is to be given from it's Common-Prayer, Articles, Homilies, Canons confirmed, ratified Decrees of Convocations, Acts for Uniformity of publick Prayer, and the unanimous Consent of most of it's Eminent Fathers, and Learned Divines, since the Reformation, down till this time. Therefore I can't allow any single Man's private Meaning, or Assertion, or unratified Book of Canons, to pass for the Doctrine of the whole Church; consequently this Author's Meaning, [*Pag. 2. line the last*] in expounding, or rather expunging this Saying, that *Kings had their Power from God*; and his Authorities and Quotations out of one or two Men, as Bp. Bilson, [*Pag. 6.*] Bp. Bedel, [*Pag. 8.*] &c. or the Meeting of a Convocation, the Preparation of a Book of Canons, and the letting fall of the whole Matter, [*Pag. 7.*] are no Arguments to prove, what is the Doctrine of the Church of England.

Next, the Maxims of Princes and States, in their Dealings one with another, in their Treaties, Embassies, and Negotiations are no Rules, where-

whereby to know the Doctrine of the Church of *England*; and therefore the Case of the *French* Protestants, or of the Provinces in the *Netherlands*, so much insisted on by this Author, [*Pag. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.*] is nothing to the purpose, in relation to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*: Neither is one Passage in an Office, composed on a particular Occasion of the King's demanding a Supply, [*Pag. 9.*] for those of the Reformed Religion, of any Force in this Matter: because when two Princes, independent one of another, fall out, such a War can't be call'd Rebellion; and if one of those Princes has interposed his Mediation with the other, and the other accepted his Mediation, by entering into Articles of Agreement, between him and his Subjects, and afterwards the Treaty has been broken, I know no harm, if the Prince, who was the Mediator, claims the Right he has by that Mediatorship, of revenging the Breach of the Articles, of demanding a Supply, in order to it, from his own Subjects, and ordering a Fast, and Form of Prayer, to beg God's Assistance in his own just Quarrel.

I come in the last place to the Consideration of the Articles and Homilies, which, if this Author could have brought over to his Side, would have been, indeed, solid and undeniable Arguments. But it will appear, that the Articles, and Homilies, may stand in as full force as ever, and yet this Author's Reasons never the stronger for them.

I shall begin with the Articles, and reckon up the Author's Citations out of, and Inferences from them.

1st, He cites the 6th Article, [*Pag. 4.*] wherein the Books of the Apocrypha were indeed declared not to be a part of the Canon, but yet to be useful for the Example of Life, and the Instruction of Manners. And then brings out of those Apocrypha, the Books of Maccabees, which contain the History of the Jews shaking off the Yoke of the Syrian Kings, when they were broke in upon, by a total Overthrow of the whole Law; and that Mattathias, a private Priest, began the Resistance.

2^{dly}, He adds, That this Resistance was foretold by Daniel, in Terms of high Commendation, and also mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as the Work and Effect of their Faith. He finds his Cause looks but desperate, under the weak Protection of an Apocryphal Authority, and therefore strives to prop and reinforce it, by stronger Evidence from the Canon of Old and New Testament.

3^{dly}, He thence infers, That if all Resistance to illegal and barbarous Persecution is unlawful, these Books contain nothing but a History of a Rebellion; and all the Devotion that runs through them, is but a Cant, and we ought to tear them out of our Bibles with Detestation.

Lastly, He promises to shew, what Use was made of these Books, by private Writers of our Church, and by what the whole Body, in Convocation, was about to determine.

I go on to the Homilies, and lay down what the Author observes upon the second Book, which contains those against Willful Rebellion.

1st, He saith, that 'tis generally believed, Bp. Jewell composed that Book; and then concludes, that, since he understood the meaning of those Homilies best, we ought to expound them, according to his Sense and Notion, clearly gathered out of two Passages in the Defence of his Apology

logy for the Church of England, whereby it appears, he thought a Defence against unjust and illegal Violence was not Rebellion: In these words, The Nobles of Scotland fought only the Defence of their Lives, against barbarous and cruel Invasions: And, Luther, and Melanchthon, teach the People not to rebel against their Prince, but only to defend themselves by all lawful means against Oppression, as did David against Saul; so do the Nobles of France at this Day.

2dly, He quotes [Pag. 5.] a Prayer at the end of every Division of the Homily, against Willful Rebellion, (and, adds he, by the by, Willful was not put in the Title for nothing) for those oppressed by Tyranny, in other Parts, that they might be relieved; and that those who were in fear of their Cruelty might be comforted.

Having thus marshalled, to the best advantage I can, this Man's Arguments, I'll proceed to make a distinct and direct Reply to every single one, as they lie in order. And first for the Articles.

1st, The 6th Article, in the Sentence alledg'd by him, is not fairly quoted, but only by halves: For the Church does read the *Apocrypha* for Example of Life and Instruction; but yet does not apply them to establish any Doctrine. Therefore the Church disclaims the Authority of the *Maccabees* among the rest, in relation to the establishing any Doctrine. Besides (as I have observed before) the Church inserts not the *Maccabees* to be read publickly in the Calendar of Lessons. Before I pass farther, I can't but take notice that, as the Devil (*Matth. iv. 6.*) quoted, in his Temptation of our Saviour, the 11th Verse of the 91st Psalm, and left out these words (*in all thy ways*) which were most material, and overthrew what he designed to infer from the rest; just so this Man has served one of the Articles of our Church; and 'tis no ways advisable such a one as he should ever be trusted with the Exposition of them, for fear he should pervert them all alike.

2dly, I have perused the xith of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and I desire him to shew me there the Resistance of the *Maccabees*, mention'd as the Work and Effect of their Faith. I wonder not at this Man's making bold with the Articles of our Church, since he spares not even the Holy Scripture. I grant indeed, that the Margin of our Bibles, and Dr. Hammond in his Paraphrase on the 35th, and 36th Verses of that Chapter refer us, for the meaning of that place, to the 2 *Maccab. c. 7. v. 7, 9. and c. 6. v. 19, 30.* But (besides that mentioning and meaning is not the same thing; the one in express Terms commanding our belief; the other giving a larger Allowance for guessing) these References, as well as Dr. Hammond's Notes relate only to *Eleazar a Scribe*, and to the Seven Brethren, and their Mother being martyr'd for their Constancy in adhering to the Jewish Laws given them by God; and I am not able to discover, that *Mattathias* and his Resistance, is any way concern'd as a Sharer in that Commendation. And as to the Prophet *Daniel*, because I pretend not to a clear Understanding of those Prophecies, I have consulted St. Hierome, and the Notes of an English Bible (Printed Anno. 1599.) on the 11th Chapter, where I find the 32. & 33. Verses applied to the Persecution of the Jews, under *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and the 34th Verse to *Mattathias*: But yet I read in the Text no other Terms of high

Com:

Commendation except these, v. 32. *The People that do know their God, shall be strong, and do Exploits.* The *Jews* are said to know God, because they refused to conform themselves to the Manners of the Gentiles, (2 Maccab. vi. 9, 10, 11.) And it is foretold they should be strong, and do Exploits; and so it happen'd that they were, and did. But yet in all this, I see no Commendation of their Resistance, or that it was the Work and Effect of their Faith.

3dly, The Books of *Maccabees* contain something else besides the History of *Mattathias's* Resistance, for they have several Chapters concerning the *Jews* Constancy and Martyrdom; and we may follow the Examples of them, who patiently suffer'd, without commending, or imitating those, who resisted upon the account of Religion. The Canonical Scriptures themselves set before us good and bad Examples, and we may safely read, and zealously copy after the Repentance of *David*, without expressing a Fit of fanatical Indignation, by tearing the Chapters, which give us an account of his Murther and Adultery.

Lastly, What use Dr. *Bedel*, a private Writer of our Church, [Pag. 8.] makes of the *Maccabees*, to justify the resisting force by force, is nothing to it's publick Doctrine; And it is not what a Convocation is about to determine, but what it hath determined, which ought to fix our Judgment.

In the next Place, let us consider, what this Author argues out of the Second Book of Homilies.

1st, Bishop *Jewel* is generally believed to have compos'd it: Still this is no Certainty; for what if he hath not? Such a general Belief is no ground to build a Doctrine upon. Again, suppose we grant he has compos'd them, must we recede from the plain and express words of those Homilies, which have received so much Authority from our Church, as to be read publickly; and embrace rather what he writes in the Defence of his Apology, which never yet obtained such a publick Sanction. Then for the Bishop's knowing his own meaning, that's nothing to the plain Doctrine of the Church: And who knows, but that a Bishop (subject, as other private Men, to Infirmities) may at one time have a quite different meaning from what he had at another. And again, tho' in the lower Capacity of a Priest, he preached with Exceptions in his Thoughts, and did not think it necessary to mention, and impart the same to the Vulgar; yet in the higher Station of a Bishop, he may, with a greater Condescension, (according to the Proverb, *quò celsior, eò humilior*) think it timely, and therefore necessary to open the Exceptions hitherto locked up in his Thoughts, and so enlighten the Simple and Ignorant, with new and unheard-of Discoveries.

2dly, What *Willful* was put into the Title for, this Author should have declared; else who can tell what he inferrs from it?

The Prayer, which he quotes, does not prove the Lawfulness of Resistance, but only begs God's Relief for those oppressed by Tyranny. It sends us for Redress, and Remedy, not to the People, but to God, who is the Origin of Sovereignty and Dominion. For that Kings are the Ministers of God, and have his Authority, we are informed by one of the Collects of our Church, after the Commandments in the Communion-Service; and I wish this Author would produce a Common-Prayer-

Prayer-Book, that has wanted this Collect, from the Year 1549, to this present Year 1710: If he can't, I may safely affirm, That the continued Doctrine of our Church, ever since the Reformation, for the Space of above 160 Years, has been this; that *Kings are Ministers of God, and have their Authority from him*; and therefore they have *jus Divinum*: For the Word *Jus*, in our *English Dictionaries*, is render'd by *Right*, or *Authority*.

I have two Remarks more to make; one on a Passage out of Dr. Bedel, quoted [Pag. 8.] the other on what this Author says, [Pag. 16.] in the Close of his Discourse.

1. Dr. Bedel's Passage, is this; That notwithstanding the Case of resisting Force by Force, the Person of the Prince himself, ought always to be sacred and inviolable, as was Saul to David. I now desire to know, why, if a King leaves to be King, and degenerates into a Tyrant, as soon as he leaves off to govern by Law, (which this Man proves out of K. James's Speech, 1609.) his Person must be more Sacred than any other's, since he has forfeited his Kingly Character? Why should the King's Person be more Sacred at last, than at first? Suppose that honest Subjects (yet I beg Pardon; for how can they be called *Subjects*, in whom is lodged the Origin of Royal Power) should be forced to resist, and stand for their Liberties, which are usurped by their Rebellious Kings, or (to speak in the Dialect of those Resistance-men) their Representatives; suppose also that this Resistance could not be effected without bringing a War either Foreign or Civil, upon the Usurper of their Liberties, and the Usurper (once their King) should, instead of running away, stand the brunt of a Battle, what proviso shall then be made for the King's Person (which must be sacred and inviolable tho') in the midst of a fierce and hot Engagement? How shall we, and what time in that Hurry shall we have to whisper to every Bullet, to fly as gently by the King's sacred and inviolable Person, as one did when it grazed harmless on K. William's invulnerable Shoulder?

2. This Author [Pag. 16.] intimates, that before the Revolution, general Expressions might very well have been used in setting forth Passive-Obedience, and Non-Resistance, because odious Cases ought not to be supposed, and therefore not to be named; but after the Revolution, all Resistance ought not to be condemned in such crude and general Terms, because it is a condemning the Revolution. I would ask him (for he owns Pag. 1. that the Doctrine of the Church of England is concern'd in this) Whether the Doctrine of the Church is in the least altered by the Revolution: For his meaning seems to hint it; else, why might not the same Expressions be used after as before? If the Doctrine is altered, how comes it that our Common-Prayers, Articles, and Homilies have not taught us yet, what new particular Expressions to use instead of the ancient Crude and general Ones? Tho' odious Cases were not to be supposed, or named, yet what need was there of excluding all Cases, by inserting in the Declaration, mentioned in the Act of Uniformity, these words, upon any Pretence whatsoever? Nay, I will affirm, these four words were not put here for nothing, and have as great an Emphasis in this place, as the Author pretends, [Page 5.] the one word *Willful* to have in the Title of the Homily against Rebellion. This, I hope, none will deny, that

that it is a very bold *Willfulness*, to set up a *Pretence* for doing that which we are forbidden to do upon any *Pretence whatsoever*.

The last *Quare* I shall make is, whether if the Doctrines of the Church and of any Revolution, should hereafter happen to clash, we must entirely, right or wrong, stick to the first for fear of condemning the latter?

I shall now leave this Author to answer my Questions at his leisure; and shall conclude the whole by stating the Case of *Saul* and *David*, as it is exactly in the Holy Bible, Since Bishop *Jewel* [Pag. 5.] and Bishop *Bedel* [Pag. 8.] lay it down for our Pattern.

Saul was chosen by God (1 Sam. ix. 16, 17. and x. 24.) the first King of the *Jews*; and afterward (1 Sam. xv. 26, 28.) rejected by him from being King, because he had rejected the Word of the Lord: and his Kingdom was at that Day rent from him, and given to one better than him. Straight upon this, God (1 Sam. xvi. 1, 13, 14.) provides him a King among *Jesse's* Sons, and *Samuel* by his order anoints *David*; and from that day forward the Spirit of the Lord came upon *David*, and departed from *Saul*, who was now troubled with an evil Spirit. *David* is call'd to play with his Harp before King *Saul*, and give him Ease, when the evil Spirit was upon him: So *David* gain'd *Saul's* Favour, and became his Armour-Bearer: and (1 Sam. xviii. 1, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19, 21, 28, 29, 30.) behaving himself wisely, was by him set over the Men of War, and was not only accepted in the Sight of all the People and of *Saul's* Servants, but commenced a most intimate Friendship between himself and *Jonathan Saul's* Son. *Saul's* Envy to this Favourite began to work, especially because the Women had met him dancing and singing, ascribing ten thousands to *David*, and to *Saul* but thousands. *Saul* takes an Opportunity to cast, in his mad Fit, a Javelin at him, but *David* avoided out of his Presence twice. *Saul* gives him his Daughter *Merab*, with a private Design, that he should fall by the *Philistines*, against whom he engaged him to fight; but then he alters his Mind, and gives *Merab* to *Adriel*, and his younger Daughter *Michal* to *David*, that she might be a Snare unto him. Yet the Lord was with *David*, and *Saul* was the more afraid of him, and became *David's* Enemy continually, so (1 Sam. xix. 1, 7, 10, 11, 18.) as to speak to *Jonathan*, and to all his Servants that they should kill him. *Jonathan* brings his Friend again into Favour; yet no sooner was the mad Fit returned upon *Saul*, that he sought to smite *David* to the Wall with his Javelin, but he fled and escaped that Night: He is pursued by the King's Messengers, and escaped by *Michal's* Stratagem; then he betakes himself to *Samuel*, to *Ramah*, and with him dwelt at *Naioth*, where first *Saul's* Messengers, and then *Saul* himself follow'd him, and had seized him, if they and he had not upon the spot become Prophets by a miraculous Change effected by God. *David* (1 Sam. xx. 1, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33.) flies from *Naioth*, and expostulates this hard Case to *Jonathan*, who striving once more to work his Reconciliation hardly escapes with his Life from his Father who threw a Javelin at him. He now seeing himself past all hopes of regaining *Saul's* Favour, taking the City *Nob* (1 Sam. xxi. 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11.) in his way to refresh himself gets Provision of Bread, and *Goliath's*

Goliath's Sword from *Abimelech* the Priest; then fled to *Achish* King of *Gath*; where being known, and not daring to trust himself he feigned Madness, and then (1 Sam. xxii. 1, 5, 6, 9, 18, 19, 20.) departed to the Cave *Adullam*, where his Brethren and Relations met him, and several indebted and discontented People flocked to him, and he became Captain over 400 Men. Thence he went to *Mizpeh* to the King of *Moab*, and having recommended his Kindred to him, retired by the Prophet *Gad's* Advice to the Forest of *Hareth*, where *Saul* had Tidings of him, and in his Rage, ordered *Doeg*, the *Edomite*, the Informer to slay *Abimelech* and all the Priests, and to smite the City *Nob* with the Sword, but *Abiathar* the Son of *Abimelech* fled after *David*. Afterwards *David* (1 Sam. xxiii. 2, 7, 8, 13, 15, 18, 24, 27, 29.) having asked Counsel of God, rescued *Keilah* from the *Philistines*; and upon *Saul's* coming to besiege that City and to surprize him, he ran away to the Wilderness of *Ziph*, where he had not been long before the *Ziphites* offer to betray him to *Saul*, and therefore he hastened to the Wilderness of *Maon*; thither again he was so close followed, that there was but a Mountain between him and *Saul*; and had inevitably fallen into his Hands, if a Message of the *Philistines* invading the Land had not turned *Saul* back from pursuing him; *David* shifted this Place which was like to have proved fatal to him, and for more Security dwelt in strong Holds at *Engedi*. But no Place could protect him from the Spies and insatiable Malice of *Saul*, who (1 Sam. xxiv. 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 21, 22.) immediately upon his return from following the *Philistines* came to *Engedi* with 3000 chosen men, where *David* happening to meet with him in a Cave might as easily have slain him as have cut off the Skirt of his Robe, (and even for doing that, his Heart smote him) had he not been too conscientious to put forth his Hand against the Lord's Anointed. *Saul* being for the time melted into Tears by this unparalleled Loyalty of *David* went home. Notwithstanding, his Malice return'd, and (1 Sam. xxvi. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 21, 25.) through the *Ziphites* Means and Discovery he renew'd his Pursuit after *David* with three thousand Men in the Wilderness of *Ziph*: There again he experienced *David's* Tenderness, who, tho' God had seemed, by a deep Sleep cast upon *Saul* and his Army to have given him a providential Opportunity of avenging himself of his Enemy, yet did no more than take his Spear, and Cruse of Water, rebuking *Abishai* who was for improving this Occasion, with these Words, which are the Standard of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance; *Destroy him not, for who can stretch forth his Hand against the Lord's anointed, and be guiltless? As the Lord liveth, the Lord shall smite him, or his Day shall come to die, or he shall descend into Battle, and perish; the Lord forbid that I should stretch forth my Hand against the Lord's anointed.* This repeated Instance of *David's* Non-Resistance (which is grown a Paradox in our Days, and runs counter to the now-modish Law of Nature, *If a Man find his Enemy, will he let him go well away?* 1 Sam. xxiv. 19.) extorted an Act of Repentance and Confession from *Saul*, who having taken his leave peaceably returned to his Place. *David* (1 Sam. xxvii. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10.) however, having tried, how slippery *Saul's* Faith was, and how prone he was to relapse into his unaccountable Malice, resolved to quit his Country, where

where he was in Danger of perishing one Day by the Hand of *Saul*; and with the 600 Men that were with him, went into the Land of the *Philistines* to *Achish* King of *Gath*; which when *Saul* heard, he sought no more again for him. There *David* made several Inrodes upon the *Geshurites*, *Gezrites*, and *Amalekites*, tho' he pretended to *Achish* to have invaded the South of *Judah*; which made *Achish* conclude, that there was no fear of *David's* forsaking his Service, since he had made *Israel* utterly to abhor him. Soon after (1 Sam. xxviii. 1, 2.) a War breaking out between the *Philistines* and the *Israelites*, *Achish* requires the Assistance of *David* and his Men; *David* told him he should know what he could do, and by him is appointed Captain of his own Guards. As (1 Sam. xxix. 2, 3, 6, 8.) the Lords of the *Philistines* muster'd their Army in *Aphec*, and *David* and his Men appeared in the Rereward with *Achish*, the Lords not daring to trust *David's* Fidelity tho' highly commended by *Achish*; *Achish* is forced to send *David* back into the Land of the *Philistines*, who shewed his concern for his being suspected, in these Words, *What have I done? and what hast thou found in thy Servant so long as I have been with thee unto this Day, that I may not go fight against the Enemies of my Lord the King?*

From *David's* Carriage, which I have in the very Scripture Words both fully and fairly represented; I observe, that *David*, tho' actually, by God's Direction annointed King, made no manner of Resistance (unless it were by running away) against *Saul*, tho' he was for rebelling against God rejected by him, tho' he acted contrary to the End of his Institution, by invading the Rights of his Subject *David*, seeking his Life, and hunting him, as a *Partridge on the Mountains* (1 Sam. xxvi. 20.) At last, that he might be out of *Saul's* reach, he goes to live in the Country of the *Philistines* with King *Achish*; but we read not that he did invite or stir up the *Philistines* against *Saul*; yea rather, he even then served his King, and fought against the Enemies of his Country. There happen'd then, that the *Philistines* gather'd their Armies together to Fight against the *Israelites*; we find not that *David*, of his good Will, engaged in that Quarrel; till King *Achish*, under whose Protection he lived, demanding his Service, he either out of Fear or Gratitude, or both, profered it, and seemed angry when it was refused by the Lords of the *Philistines*. And *Procopius* on 1 Sam. xxix. 4. observes, that this was brought about by God's Providence; either that he might not shed his Country-Men's Blood; or that he might not (as the Lords of the *Philistines* suspected, 1 Sam. xxix. 4.) go over to and help his Master *Saul*, whom God had determined to punish for his Disobedience.

In this View of *David's* whole Behaviour, there shines throughout a Detestation of Resistance, tho' no Subjects ever could or can produce such Reasons for it as he. He could have claimed Divine Right on his side, being by God himself designed and annointed Successour to the rejected King his Enemy; having by his Successes against Enemies abroad, and wise Deportment at home, ingratiated himself into the Peoples Favour, and having twice, by a miraculous Providence, had an Opportunity thrown upon him of securing himself for ever against *Saul's* Malice. The Proffer indeed, of his Service to *Saul's* Enemies, I can't, nor am I bound to commend; neither am I sure, that God, who did not suf-

fer it, did approve it. In short, it was involuntary, and forced, and therefore the more unfit for Imitation.

But, least the Justifiers of *Resistance* should nevertheless, and against all Reason, (for Reason is a Queen and Sovereign, *ratio omnium Domina & Regina*, Cic. Tusc. 2. and many times finds no quarter with these Resisters to Sovereign Power) insist upon this, that David's Example must be followed, as well when he offer'd to resist, as when he stuck to *Non-Resistance*; I will (protesting still against it as none of my Opinion yet) for the sake of Compliance and Moderation that darling Word of theirs, (and in good earnest nothing but a mere Word, and what they seldom stand to, when their other more darling Word *Occasion* comes in their way) suppose it, and, according to their Hearts Desire, state the Matter exactly after the Pattern of David, thus: A Subject ought never to resist while he is unlawfully persecuted by his Prince in his own Country, tho' Providence did furnish him with never so many Occasions to free himself from that unlawful Persecution.

† Matth. x. 23. When they persecute you in this City, He ought (if he can) to † fly into another Country, and live there; but not to invade or stir up the Prince of that Country against his own: If it happened that these two Princes should engage in a War, it is not his Business to list himself in the Quarrel, until the Prince, into whose Country he fled, require his assistance, and encourage it by giving him a Commission under him.

I believe that our *Resisting Men* will hardly like these Articles, as being somewhat too narrow for their Cases, Exceptions, Distinctions, Views, and Meanings; which they enlarge like Hell: and most miserable is that Prince, whose Authority is to be subjected to, and tryed by, those Measures of Obedience.

I'll now, Reader, release thy Patience, and freely own my Opinion to be, that all Church-Men ought (Tit. iii. 1.) to put the People in mind to be subject to Principalities and Powers, to obey Magistrates; and that they ought not to declare or determine, when it is lawful for Subjects to oppose and resist Governours; till they can produce as divine and express a Command for the last, as is produced for the first.

POSTSCRIPT.

A Gentleman has in print lately offer'd some Considerations to the Bishop of Salisbury, wherein he makes out that there is a direct Opposition between his Lordship's former Doctrine, and what he has now advanced. I here, in his Lordship's Vindication, shall very briefly answer this Gentleman; that notwithstanding all this seeming Contradiction, my Lord at the bottom has been, and is, always the same; as I have observed before *Pag. 7.* But a wise and political Man does not always strictly confine himself to the common dull road of speaking as he means, and meaning as he speaks. 'Tis a more refined and out-of-the-way Piece of Subtilty to have two Strings to one's Bow, and, in all our Words or Writings, to have the back Door of some Exceptions in View, to slip out at, whenever we think we need it.